

REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on October 17, 2007. Claims 1-19 are standing for examination.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10-13 and 15-19 stand rejected over US Publication 2003/0041206 to Dickie, hereinafter Dickie. Claims 2, 9 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Dickie in view of US Pub. 2003/0011868. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Dickie in view of Chestnut, US Pub. 2003/0195904.

In reviewing the action and the examiners' comments and reasoning, and the examiner's Response to the Applicant's arguments, the applicant is struck by the broad nature of the references applied and the manner in which the claims are rejected. The examiner seems to be confusing data with program code, and doesn't seem to consider some of the limitations of the claims. It is quite clear the apparatus and functions taught in the references applied are far from the nature of the present invention. On the other hand the applicant notes that the claims are quite broad as well, and this may be the reason for the examiner's broad interpretation and application.

Accordingly the applicant has caused claim 1-19 to be cancelled, and has provided new claims 20 – 41 for examination. New claim 20 is analogous in many ways to original claim 1, but recites new limitations not recited in claim 1, making claim 20 more specific and narrow than claim 1. Specifically the applicant has added a limitation that the computer program is specific to microprocessor-controlled device to be controlled, the device having a limited set of functions, and limitations to a user using an interactive interface provided by the computer appliance to select individual functions from the limited set and times for initiation for the selected functions from the limited set.

These new limitations are nowhere to be found in the references cited and applied, so the rejections are moot, and new claim 20 is patentable over the art of record. Claims 21-30, depended from claim 20, are patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim. Claim 31 is a method claim following the limitations of claim 1, including the

new limitations argued above, and is patentable by the same facts and arguments put forth above on behalf of claim 20. So claims 32-41 are patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

The new claims are clearly allowable over the art applied, and the applicant therefore respectfully requested that the claims be allowed and that this case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
R. Cameron Marcus

By *Donald R. Boys*
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.
3 Hangar Way, Suite D
Watsonville, CA 95076
831-768-1755